

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRB-3145/2dn
MES:med;jm

January 12, 2012

Representative Steineke:

This version of the draft incorporates into the bill most of the items from the instructions you sent me. Under created sub. (2), however, I did not remove from the intro. the material relating to a comprehensive plan and move it to paragraphs (a) and (b) as shown in the email you sent.

I believe that the bill still reflects your substantive intent, but is more logical and workable as drafted. Pam Kahler and I have looked at this issue and it seems to us that the bill just didn't really work if those two items relating to the comprehensive plan are not in the intro. Because the intro. already is predicated on a municipality having enacted a comprehensive plan, it seems much less confusing to put those elements in the intro. instead of being one of 4 possible conditions that could lead to the enactment of a moratorium.

It also seems that the current pars. (a) and (b) are the "events" or conditions that could lead a municipality to decide to enact a moratorium, not the elements related to the comprehensive plan. Of course if you really would like the comprehensive planning items to be removed from the intro. and added as pars. (a) and (b), we can redraft the bill, but it is my opinion that the bill, as drafted, is a much more effective way to achieve what I understand to be your intent.

Marc E. Shovers
Managing Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-0129
E-mail: marc.shovers@legis.wisconsin.gov